UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,591	11/07/2001	Ran J. Flam	sparta01.005	4352

25247 7590 06/02/2005

GORDON E NELSON
PATENT ATTORNEY, PC
57 CENTRAL ST
PO BOX 782
ROWLEY, MA 01969

EXAMINER	
STEVENS, ROBERT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/036,591	FLAM, RAN J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M Stevens	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 January 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: **Application No. 10/036,591** amendment filed 1/24/2005 to the original application filed 11/7/2001 by Flam entitled "GUI for Automated Process Control".

2. The Office withdraws objections raised in the First Action on the Merits (FAOM) concerning the specification in light of the amendment.

3. The Office withdraws objections raised in the First Action on the Merits (FAOM) concerning the drawings in light of the amendment.

4. The Office withdraws claim rejections under 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd paragraphs raised in the FAOM, in light of the amendment.

5. The Office withdraws claim rejections under 35 USC 101 raised in the FAOM, in light of the amendment.

6. The FAOM rejections of claims under 35 USC 103(a) have been maintained in spite of the amendment.

7. Claims 1-19 are pending. Claim 1 is independent. These claims stand rejected as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Texier (US Patent No. 5,119,476, issued Jun. 2, 1992, hereafter referred to as "Texier") in view of Schultz et al. (US Patent No. 5,812,133, issued Sep. 22, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Schultz").

Regarding independent claim 1, Texier discloses:

A graphical user interface (Fig. 1) *for specifying an action to be performed* (Fig. 1 Base File re: "See/Modify Employee") *on a field of a record stored in a memory device when a query with which the action is associated returns the record, the query being executed on a processor that has access to the memory device and interacts with the GUI* (Fig. 1 Employee Information window, it being implicit that a query will execute via a processor/memory and interact with the GUI window and that data items such as record fields are stored in memory), *the graphical user interface comprising:*

> *a window containing a table wherein the field of the record has an entry that is selectable by the user,* (Fig. 1 Employee Information window)
> *the entry including*
> *a first field of the entry that identifies the field of the record to be acted on;* (Fig. 1 Base File re: "New Employee") *and*

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *one or more action fields that, when the user has selected the entry, the user may set to specify the action.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *one or more action fields of the entry that, when the user has selected the entry, the user may set to specify the action* (Fig. 5 "Task name" column)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

> *the identified field's values belong to one of a plurality of types;* (Fig. 1 "Base File" window and col. 6 lines 16-20 discussing a menu) *and*

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *the action fields in the entry are determined by the type of the identified field's values.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *the action fields in the entry are determined by the type of the identified field's values.* (Fig. 5 tasks 90-96 list actions to be performed on a particular system, the system name [e.g. System 1] being analogous to a first field)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to

monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 2, the limitations of claim 2 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

> *the plurality of types include types whose values belong to ordered sets that are defined in the system in which the graphical user interface is used* (col. 6 lines 16-20 discussing a menu), ... , *and types whose values specify persons* (Fig. 1 "Employee Information" window)

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *types whose values specify times*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *types whose values specify times* (Fig. 5 re: condition column and watchdog column)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, Texier discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify that the identified field be cleared. (Fig. 1"Base File" window, noting selection of New Employee to clear windows)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a value and to specify that the value be assigned to the identified field.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a value and to specify that the value be assigned to the identified field. (Fig. 5 watchdog column values for user tasks 90-96 were specified/assigned before they could be shown in table #88)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

wherein when the field's entry is selected, the user may set (Fig. 1 Base File window) ...

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *the action fields to specify an operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value which is the identified field's value when the record is returned.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *the action fields to specify an operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value which is the identified field's value when the record is returned.* (Fig. 5, computing an indentified field [e.g., "Programs" field of #94, computed from value of "Condition" field], and col. 8 lines 45-56)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, the limitations of claim 6 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

> *wherein the field's value belongs to an ordered set of values;* (Fig. 1 "Base File" window and col. 6 lines 16-20 discussing a menu) *and*

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *the user may set the action fields to specify an increment operation wherein the new value is a value that follows the identified field's current value in the ordered set of values.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *the user may set the action fields to specify an increment operation wherein the new value is a value that follows the identified field's current value in the ordered set of values.* (Fig. 5 #100 and 98, specifying a system name field, which is analogous to a listing/ordered set of employees, as found in Texier))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

> *wherein the identified field may have a null value when the record is returned;* (Fig. 1 "Base File" window for creation of a "New Employee" entry) *and*

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *the user may set the action fields to specify an action that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or an action that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *the user may set the action fields to specify an action that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or an action that is to*

> *be performed when the identified field does not have the null value.* (Fig. 5 "Condition" column allows a user to set values and "Programs" column shows conditional actions to be performed [especially noting task #94])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a reference field which is another field in the record and a reference field operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value of the reference field, the current value being the value that the reference field has when the record is returned from the query.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a reference field which is another field in the record* (Fig. 5 #94 "task name" field contains subfield [reference] value of "3") *and a reference field operation* (Fig. 5 #94 "Condition" field) *by which a new value for the identified field* (Fig. 5 #94 "Program" field)*may be computed from a current value of the reference field , the current value being the value that the reference field has when the record is returned from the query.* (Fig. 5 #94 "Condition" reference field value being "LS101=TRUE")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

> *wherein the identified field may have a null value when the record is returned;* (Fig. 1 "Base File" window re: "New Employee" selection to empty or set field to NULL) *and*

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *the user may set the action fields to specify a first reference field and a first reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or a second reference field and a second reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *the user may set the action fields to specify a first reference field and a first reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value* (Fig. 5 #94 for "Condition" field value of "LS101=TRUE", "Program" field value indicates that performed operation is "CAN FILL") *and/or a second reference field and a second reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value* (Fig. 5 #94 for "Condition" field value of "LS101=FALSE", "Program" field value indicates that performed operation is "CAN STOP").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 9, Texier discloses:

> *wherein the reference field operation assigns the current value of the reference field to the identified field.* (Fig. 1"Base File" window, re: "See/Modify Employee")

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the identified field and the reference field have time values; and*
> *the user may further set the action fields to specify an amount of time by which the reference field's current value is increased or decreased to compute the new value for the identified field.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *wherein the identified field and the reference field have time values;* (Fig. 5 shows use of time values in "Condition" and "Watch Dog" fields for tasks 90-96) *and*
> *the user may further set the action fields to specify an amount of time by which the reference field's current value is increased or decreased to compute the new value for the identified field.* (Fig. 5 #96 "Condition" field value = 20%)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 12, the limitations of claim 12 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify the amount of time in one of a plurality of ways.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify the amount of time in one of a plurality of ways.* (Fig. 5 #94 "Condition" field can be set to one of a plurality of values [TRUE/FALSE], which accordingly affects the amount of time - as reflected in the "Watch Dog" field)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 13, the limitations of claim 13 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein one of the plurality of ways is days; and*
> *when days have been specified, the user may further set the action fields to specify whether the days will be computed as business days or calendar days.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

> *wherein one of the plurality of ways is days;* (Fig. 5 #90 "Watch Dog" field contains a time value. "Days" is, by way of analogy, a time value.) *and*
> *when days have been specified, the user may further set the action fields to specify whether the days will be computed as business days or calendar days.* (Fig. 5 #90 "Watch Dog" field contains a time value. "Days" [whether calendar or business] is, by way of analogy, a time value.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 12, the limitations of claim 12 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

> *wherein one of the reference fields is a field whose value is always set to the current time when the query returns the record.*

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein one of the reference fields is a field whose value is always set to the current time when the query returns the record. (Fig. 7a #202 discloses the use of current time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 1, Texier discloses:

wherein the identified field has a person value; (Fig. 1"Employee Information" window) *and*
the user may set the action fields to specify a role reference field from which a new person value for the identified field may be obtained, the role reference field referring to an ordered set of person values wherein one of the person values is a last-used person value and the role reference field obtaining the next person value following the last-used person value at the time the record is returned as the new person value for the identified field. (Fig. 1"Base File" window)

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 16, Texier discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify a person reference field that has a person value, the identified field being set from the value of the person reference field when the record is returned. (Fig. 1"Employee Information" window)

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 17, Texier discloses:

wherein another action has been specified which assigns the person reference field a value from a role reference field; (Fig. 1" Employee Information" window, including P7 validate button) *and*

when the record is returned, actions which assign person fields values from role reference fields are performed prior to other actions. (Fig. 1" Employee Information" window, including P7 validate button)

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 16, Texier discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to directly specify a person value, the identified field being set from the directly-specified person value when the record is returned. (Fig. 1" Employee Information" window, including P7 validate button)

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 1/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks (pages 19-20 of the amendment) concerning FAOM objections to the specification and rejections of claims under 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd paragraphs have been addressed previously.

Regarding the FAOM rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 USC 103 (a), Applicant first argues (re: claim 1) on pages 12-14 that Texier does not disclose a GUI for performing actions on record fields. However, the Office notes that the referenced Fig. 1 of Texier discloses, inter alia, a GUI for updating employee records (and fields contained within those records).

Applicant further argues (re: claim 1) on pages 14-16 that the referenced Fig. 5 of the secondary reference, Schultz, is not a GUI and therefore is not applicable. However, the Office has cited Fig. 5 to show the well-known use of fields and not to necessarily show a GUI. The Office also points out that the rejection sets forth obviousness, and not anticipation, issues.

The Office therefore maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 1-19 as being unpatentable over Texier in view of Schultz under 35 USC 103(a).

Applicant argues on pages 16-18 that the Texier and Schultz references are deficient vice claims 1, 4 and 11. Claim 1 has been addressed above. Regarding claim 4, Applicant merely states that the clearing of fields is somehow patentable. However, what one does with a field (set it or clear it) is merely a matter of obvious design choice. Regarding claim 11, Applicant asserts that Applicant's data fields are different that Texier's data fields. However, what one puts into data fields is merely a mater of obvious design choice.

The Office therefore maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 1-19 as being unpatentable over Texier in view of Schultz under 35 USC 103(a).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: May 27, 2005

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
May 31, 2005